

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

This application is believed to be in condition for allowance because the claims, as amended, are non-obvious and patentable over the cited references. The following paragraphs provide the justification for this belief. In view of the following reasoning for allowance, the Applicant hereby respectfully requests further examination and reconsideration of the subject patent application.

2.0 Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102:

In the Office Action of July 26, 2007, claims 1, 15-22, 35-42, 53-59, and 64-66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Applicant's admitted prior art (FIG. 2 and FIG. 3 and the corresponding text of the present application), referred to as **AAPA** by the office action. However, the Office Also indicated that claims 11-14, 31-34, 49-52, and 60-62 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In response, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 22, 42, and 59 to include allowable limitations of their respective dependent claims. In particular:

1. Independent claim 1 has been amended to include the allowable subject matter of dependent claim 11. Claim 11 has been cancelled.
2. Independent claim 22 has been amended to include the allowable limitations of dependent claim 31. Claim 31 has been cancelled.
3. Independent claim 42 has been amended to include the allowable limitations of dependent claim 49. Claim 49 has been cancelled.
4. Independent claim 59 has been amended to include the allowable limitations of dependent claim 60. Claim 60 has been cancelled.

In addition to the aforementioned amendments, dependent claims 12, 13, 33, 50, 51 and 61 have been amended to adjust claim dependencies resulting from the aforementioned claim amendments and claim cancellations.

Therefore, in view of the preceding discussion, it is clear that the present invention, as claimed by independent claims 1, 22, 42, and 59 are allowable in view of the incorporation of the allowable subject matter of dependent claims into those independent claims. Consequently, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 15-22, 35-42, 53-59, and 64-66, and objection to claims 12-14, 32-34, 50-52, and 61-62 in view of the allowability of independent claims 1, 22, 42 and 59.

2.2 Prior Restriction of Claims:

Dependent claims 2-10, 22-30, 43-48 and 63 were the subject of a prior restriction requirement. However, in view of the allowability of independent claims 1, 22, 42, and 59, as amended, Applicants respectfully suggest that dependent claims 2-10, 23-30, 43-48, and 63, previously withdrawn in response to a restriction requirement, are also allowable in view of the allowability of their respective parent claims.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that dependent claims 2-10, 23-30, 43-48, and 63, be reintroduced into the present case and allowed based on the allowability of their respective parent claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above discussion, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-10, 12-30, 32-48, 50-59, and 60-66 are in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of claims 1, 15-22, 35-42, 53-59, and 64-66, objection to claims 12-14, 32-34, 50-52, and prior restriction of claims 2-10, 23-30, 43-48, and 63, and to pass this application to issue at the earliest opportunity. In addition, in an effort to further the prosecution of the subject application, the Applicant kindly invites the Examiner to telephone the Applicant's attorney at (805) 278-8855 if the Examiner has any additional questions or concerns.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark A. Watson
Registration No. 41,370
Attorney for Applicant

Lyon & Harr
300 Esplanade Drive, Suite 800
Oxnard, California 93036
(805) 278-8855